

JASON M. WUCETICH (STATE BAR NO. 222113)  
jason@wukolaw.com  
DIMITRIOS V. KOROVILAS (STATE BAR NO. 247230)  
dimitri@wukolaw.com  
WUCETICH & KOROVILAS LLP  
222 N. Pacific Coast Hwy., Suite 2000  
El Segundo, CA 90245  
Telephone: (310) 335-2001  
Facsimile: (310) 364-5201

MICHAEL S. MORRISON (SBN 205320)  
mmorrison@amflp.com  
ERIN A. LIM (SBN 323930)  
elim@amflp.com  
ALEXANDER MORRISON + FEHR LLP  
1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Telephone: (310) 394-0888  
Facsimile: (310) 394-0811

Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
WILLIAM MULLER and ANTONIO KNEZEVICH,  
individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated

*[Additional Counsel Listed on Next Page]*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

IN RE UKG INC CYBERSECURITY  
LITIGATION

CASE NO. 22-CV-00346-SI

**CLASS ACTION**

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

**DECLARATION OF DIMITRIOS V.  
KOROVILAS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION  
FOR FINAL APPROVAL**

All Actions

Hearing Date: November 17, 2023  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Courtroom: 1  
Judge: Hon. Susan Illston

1 I, Dimitrios V. Korovilas, declare and state as follows:

2 1. I am an attorney at law duly licensed to practice before all courts in the state of  
3 California and the Northern District of California and am a partner at Wucetich & Korovilas LLP,  
4 counsel of record for Plaintiffs William Muller and Antonio Knezevich in the above-entitled  
5 action. Based on that representation, I have personal knowledge of the matters stated herein and  
6 could and would testify competently about them if called upon to do so. I make this declaration  
7 in support of the motion by all plaintiffs for final approval of the proposed settlement agreement  
8 in this matter.

9 2. The three cases underlying this consolidated action each arise from defendant  
10 UKG, Inc.'s alleged failure to implement and maintain reasonable cybersecurity procedures and  
11 practices with respect to the sensitive and confidential personal information UKG obtains from its  
12 customers' employees, the cybersecurity incident that UKG experienced beginning in December  
13 2021, and the resultant shut down of its timekeeping and payroll services that lasted for some  
14 months. My firm's case was the first-filed case of any class action still pending against UKG  
15 related to the cybersecurity incident. My firm, together with our co-counsel at Alexander  
16 Morrison + Fehr LLP, have worked cooperatively with all Plaintiffs' counsel in this consolidated  
17 action and generally taken the lead throughout the duration of this litigation, particularly in the  
18 earlier stages. As alleged in the complaint, UKG is a multi-billion-dollar workforce management  
19 technology company that provides third-party human resources services, including timekeeping  
20 and payroll services, to companies around the globe. In connection with those services, UKG  
21 collects, stores, and processes personal information and data for thousands of companies and  
22 millions of workers, including a multitude of companies and workers in California and  
23 throughout the nation. UKG's clients form a broad cross section of corporate America and public  
24 organizations, including the likes of PepsiCo, Tesla, Gamestop, the University of California  
25 system, the County of Santa Clara, and many private and public hospital and healthcare  
26 organizations, including Family Health Centers of San Diego and Wellpath Recovery Solutions,  
27 LLC. Plaintiffs assert claims on behalf of a nationwide class for negligence, negligence per se,  
28 unjust enrichment, declaratory judgment, breach of contract, and common law invasion of

1 privacy. Plaintiffs also bring claims on behalf of a California subclass for violation of the  
2 California Consumer Privacy Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.150, the California Customer Records  
3 Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.80 *et seq.*, violation of the California Unfair Competition Law, Cal.  
4 Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.*, and for invasion of privacy based on the California  
5 Constitution, Art. 1, § 1. Plaintiffs seek, among other things, compensatory damages, punitive  
6 and exemplary damages, statutory damages pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1798.150(b), injunctive  
7 relief, attorneys' fees, and costs of suit.

8         3. A true and correct copy of the parties' fully executed proposed settlement  
9 agreement, which sets forth all terms of settlement, was previously attached as Exhibit 1 the  
10 declaration of Kas Gallucci filed in support of plaintiffs' previously filed motion for preliminary  
11 approval. The settlement agreement was reached only after arms' length settlement discussions  
12 among all parties and their counsel. The agreement is a result of the parties' global mediation  
13 before Bennett Picker on September 8, 2022, as well as numerous additional follow up  
14 discussions with Mr. Picker that occurred thereafter, as well as extensive discussions with counsel  
15 in other overlapping litigation in cases pending in Florida and Massachusetts. The agreement  
16 presents the full, complete, and exclusive terms and conditions applicable to the proposed  
17 settlement. There are no "side agreements" in connection with the proposed settlement.

18         4. Plaintiffs have created an extensive factual record for this case. Prior to filing our  
19 complaint on behalf of Plaintiffs Muller and Knezevich, my offices conducted a thorough factual  
20 investigation into the facts and legal support underlying Plaintiffs claims, including extensive  
21 legal research as well as conducting interviews of many dozens of class members affected by the  
22 cybersecurity incident. Since the filing of these actions, Plaintiffs' counsel have continued their  
23 investigations, both through formal and informal discovery and other means. Among other things,  
24 Plaintiffs have propounded numerous sets of comprehensive written discovery requests, including  
25 requests for production of documents, requests for inspection, and special interrogatories.  
26 Plaintiffs have reviewed all documents produced by UKG, both formally and informally in  
27 connection with the parties' mediation, and met and conferred extensively with defense counsel  
28 regarding deficiencies and follow up regarding their productions. Plaintiffs have also cooperated

1 with Defendant's formal and informal requests for documents and information. To the extent the  
2 settlement was premised on any informally produced documents and information, the parties  
3 further agreed to additional confirmatory discovery as necessary and have since conducted such  
4 confirmatory discovery.

5         5. All plaintiffs' counsel have, furthermore, spent significant hours following up on  
6 the factual bases and merits of the claims and defenses via meet-and-confer discussions with  
7 defense counsel, internal discussions among Plaintiffs' counsel, meetings, phone calls, and  
8 significant written correspondence, in addition to their own independent investigations of the  
9 facts and defenses.

10         6. Based on my experience and review of this case, it is my opinion that the proposed  
11 settlement is fair, adequate, and reasonable, for the reasons set forth in detail in Plaintiffs' motion  
12 for preliminary approval. The successful settlement was facilitated in large part by the decision  
13 of all Plaintiffs' counsel in the California cases filed against UKG to work cooperatively from the  
14 outset. As with many other recent data breaches, multiple, overlapping class action lawsuits were  
15 filed around the country shortly after the breach was announced. Instead of spending their time to  
16 secure lead counsel status, which often results in time consuming and lengthy disputes amongst  
17 plaintiffs' counsel, Class Counsel endeavored to work cooperatively. This resulted in a joint  
18 prosecution agreement at the outset of litigation amongst Class Counsel and the filing of a  
19 consolidated complaint. By working cooperatively early on and avoiding in-fighting, Plaintiffs  
20 were able to present a united front that Defendant could not exploit through reverse auction  
21 tactics. Class Counsel also successfully kept this case out of Multi-District Litigation. This result  
22 avoided needless delays and allowed Counsel to focus its efforts on obtaining the documents and  
23 information they needed, which culminated with an early resolution of the case. Further, the  
24 cooperation allowed counsel to serve formal discovery early in the litigation and engage Defense  
25 counsel in substantive discussions which ultimately resulted in an agreement to mediate the case  
26 following an exchange of information and data relevant to issues in the case. Class Counsel then  
27 reached out to counsel with overlapping claims in other parts of the country to try to work out  
28 agreements. The result of these efforts was an agreement to carve out wage claims from the scope

1 of the Settlement so the other Plaintiffs' counsel could pursue these claims in their cases. This  
2 avoided unnecessary adversarial proceedings amongst plaintiffs and a possible objection to the  
3 settlement which could have delayed payment by years

4 7. I received my jurisdoctor degree from the University of California, at Davis,  
5 School of Law in 2006 and became licensed to practice law in California at that time. I received  
6 my bachelor's degree in economics from the University of Chicago in 2003. I co-founded by law  
7 firm, Wucetich & Korovilas LLP, with my partner, Jason M. Wucetich, in 2010. Prior to that, I,  
8 along with my partner, Mr. Wucetich, the other attorney at my firm assigned to this matter,  
9 worked together as attorneys in the litigation department of Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe's Los  
10 Angeles Office. Orrick is a large, international firm with approximately 1,000 attorneys and  
11 offices throughout the world. I also previously externed for the Honorable David F. Levi, former  
12 chief judge of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of California. My partner, Mr.  
13 Wucetich, received his jurisdoctor degree from the University of California, at Davis, School of  
14 Law in 2002 and became licensed to practice law at that time. He received his bachelor's degree  
15 in economics and political science from Stanford University in 1997. Mr. Wucetich also  
16 previously worked for several years in Los Angeles in the litigation department of Pillsbury  
17 Winthrop Shaw Pittman, another large firm, along with me, before our practice group moved to  
18 Orrick.

19 8. Throughout our practice, both previously at the large firm level and at our current  
20 firm, my partner and I have had significant experience in class action and other complex  
21 litigation, including numerous data breach and other consumer class action cases. Mr. Wucetich  
22 has personally first-chaired five jury trials and second-chaired four jury and bench trials.  
23 Complex litigation, in both the individual and class action context, has constituted a significant  
24 portion of both my partner's and my practice generally and also our day-to-day activities.  
25 Throughout our practice, we have regularly represented clients in both state and federal courts  
26 and at both the trial and appellate levels. Some of my and/or my partner's significant current and  
27 past class action and other complex cases over the course of our careers have included, among  
28 others:

- a. *In re Snap Financial Data Breach Litigation*, Case No. 2:22-cv-00761-TS-JCB (D. Utah) (consolidated consumer class action data breach case, pending);
- b. *Martinez v. Valex Corp.* Ventura County Superior Court Case No. 56-2022-00572595-CU-NP-VTA (consumer class action data breach case, successfully settled);
- c. *Contreras v. Robins & Morton Corp.*, Case No. 3:23-cv-00164-LB (N.D. Cal.) (consumer class action data breach case, pending)
- d. *Owens v. Smith, Gambrell & Russell Int'l, LLP*, Case No. 2:23-cv-01789-JAK-JDE (C.D. Cal.) (consumer class action data breach case, pending)
- e. *Johnson v. Cerebral, Inc.*, Case no. 23-cv-01901-FMO-MAA (C.D. Cal.) (consumer class action data breach case, pending);
- f. *Muller et al. v. PepsiCo, Inc. et al.*, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-22-597909 and *Stevens v. PepsiCo, Inc. et al.*, Case No. 22-cv-00802 (S.D.N.Y.) (employment class action cases stemming from UKG cybersecurity incident, successfully settled);
- g. *In re Neutron Wage & Hour Cases*, JCCP Case no. 5044, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. 21-CJC-005044 (employment class action and PAGA claims, successfully settled);
- h. *Shenkman v. Tesla, Inc.*, Alameda Superior Court Case No. RG21102833 (certified class counsel in consumer class action case, pending);
- i. *In re DirecTV Wage and Hour Cases*, JCCP Case No. 4850 (Santa Clara Superior Court) (lead case No. 1-14-CV-274709) (employment class action and PAGA claims, successfully settled);
- j. *Habelito v. Guther-Renker LLC*, Case No. BC499558 (Los Angeles Superior) (certified consumer class action case, successfully settled);
- k. *Payless Wage and Hour Cases*, JCCP Case No. 4699 (Los Angeles Superior Court) (employment class action, successfully settled);
- l. *Bernardino, et al. v. NCS Pearson, Inc.*, Case No. CIVDS1511972 (San

- 1 Bernardino Superior Court) (employment class action, successfully settled);
- 2 m. *Ledterman v. James Perse Enterprises*, Case No. BC480530 (Los Angeles
- 3 Superior) (consumer class action case, successfully settled);
- 4 n. *Stathopoulos v. Retail Brand Alliance, Inc. d/b/a Brooks Brothers*, Case No.
- 5 BC462887 (Los Angeles Superior Court) (consumer class action case, successfully
- 6 settled).
- 7 o. *Adjamian v. Sunglass Hut Trading LLC, et al.* Case No. 30-2011-00451217-CU-
- 8 BT-CXC (Orange County Superior) (consumer class action case, successfully
- 9 settled);
- 10 p. *Baghdassarian et al. v. Nordstrom, Inc.*, Case No. BC448357 (Los Angeles
- 11 Superior) (consumer class action, successfully settled);
- 12 q. *Wolff v. Hyatt Corporation et al.*, Case No. 10CV7266 (C.D. Cal.) (civil rights
- 13 class action case, successfully settled);
- 14 r. *Finseth v. Network Solutions LLC*, Case No. CV 08-1537 PSG (VBx) (C.D. Cal.)
- 15 (consumer class action case, successfully settled);
- 16 s. *McElroy v. Network Solutions LLC*, Case No. CV 08-01247 PSG (VBKx) (C.D.
- 17 Cal.) (consumer class action case, successfully settled);
- 18 t. *Carlson v. eHarmony.com, Inc.*, Case No. BC371958 (Los Angeles Superior)
- 19 (civil rights class action case, successfully settled);
- 20 u. *McNett v. Network Management Group, Inc. et al.*, Case No. BC330892 (Los
- 21 Angeles Superior) (employee misclassification class action case);
- 22 v. *Ingalls v. Hallmark Retail, Inc.*, Case No. CV08-04342 VBF(Ex), consolidated
- 23 with CV08-05330 (VBF)(FFMx), consolidated with CV08-07481 (VBF)(Ex)
- 24 (C.D. Cal.) (wage/hour employment class action);
- 25 w. *Ceryx Asset Recovery LLC v. Cummins West, Inc. et al.*, JAMS Ref. 1220035720
- 26 (represented plaintiff in complex employment and trade secrets arbitration case
- 27 that proceeded through weeks of arbitration before reaching a successful
- 28 settlement);



- x. *Tyson Foods v. Foster Farms, Rao, et al.* (multiple complex employment and trade secrets cases around the country that ultimately settled successfully);
- y. *Vident v. Dentsply International, Inc.*, Case No. SACV 06-1141 PSG (ANx) (C.D. Cal.) (represented the plaintiff in an antitrust case that resulted in an \$18 million stipulated judgment on the eve of trial);
- z. *Warren v. AW Chesterton Company et al.*, Case No. CGC-07274470 (San Francisco Superior) (represented defendant in a products liability trial that resulted in a complete defense verdict after weeks of trial);
- aa. *DHL Reseller Litigation* (represented DHL in numerous related complex commercial cases nationwide based on its exit from the domestic market, with many cases involving dozens of parties);
- bb. *ConsumerInfo.com, Inc. v. One Technologies LP et al.*, Case No. CV 09-3783 (C.D. Cal.) (complex copyright/trademark/antitrust dispute)
- cc. *Sleep Innovations, Inc. v. Sinomax USA, Inc., et al.*, Case No. CV06-5712 (AHM)(AJWx) (C.D. Cal.) (complex trade secrets case, ultimately successfully settled);
- dd. *HiRel Connectors, Inc. v. Department of Defense, et al.*, Case No. C01-11069 DT(BQRx) (C.D. Cal.), (complex trade secrets);
- ee. *Triangle Restaurants, Inc., et al. v. ERP Operating Limited Partnership*, Case No. EC050081 (Los Angeles Superior) (complex real estate litigation);

9. Currently, my firm represents plaintiffs in approximately more than a dozen pending class action or representative lawsuits, consisting of various employee, consumer, and civil rights litigation, including numerous consumer class actions arising from data breaches similar to the instant case involving allegations of failure to properly safeguard sensitive personal identification information.

10. My firm also currently represents both plaintiffs and defendants in numerous non-class action cases, including numerous employment, consumer, and contract disputes.

11. My firm is competent and ready to move forward with this litigation and proposed



1 settlement. We have no conflicts of interest with the class, nor any other conflicts of interest that  
2 would adversely affect our representation, and we are willing and able to adequately represent the  
3 class.

4 12. My firm undertook representation in this case on a contingency basis, and seeks  
5 fees based on either a lodestar figure and/or a percentage of the recovery obtained. By either of  
6 these measures, the amounts sought by my firm would be considered reasonable. My firm has  
7 kept detailed time records of all time tracked on this matter together with all disbursements.  
8 Consistent with the Northern District's guidelines, we stand ready to produce such time records  
9 should the Court request them. In connection with the instant motion, I ran a report of all billable  
10 time tracked on this matter to date with all disbursements, and report that information in this  
11 declaration.

12 13. My firm's time records show that my partner and I have collectively billed  
13 approximately 581 hours to this matter. Our work during the time period of the report has  
14 included, but is not limited to, conducting many dozens of interviews with class members  
15 affected by the UKG cybersecurity incident across many different employers, preparation of the  
16 first-filed class action complaint, extensive meet-and-confer discussions with counsel in  
17 overlapping and related litigation in California, Florida, and Massachusetts; coordination of all  
18 California cases into a consolidated action; preparation of the consolidated class action complaint;  
19 conducting of the Rule 26(f) conference and preparation of the related report; preparation of  
20 numerous sets of formal and informal discovery; review of all data and documents produced by  
21 defendant; preparation an opposition to a motion by counsel in the later-filed Massachusetts cases  
22 for transfer and coordination before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation; travel to and  
23 attendance of the hearing on that motion; review of Defendant's motion to dismiss and  
24 preparation of a draft opposition to the motion; conducting mediation, including coordination of  
25 the mediation amongst all counsel, preparation of a mediation brief, extensive meet-and-confer  
26 discussions with opposing regarding the settlement, extensive post-mediation follow up with the  
27 mediator; preparation of the settlement agreement and related papers; preparation of the motion  
28 for preliminary approval and related papers; attending status conferences and hearings before this

1 court; and extensive meet-and-confer discussions throughout the duration of this case with  
2 defense counsel, other plaintiffs' counsel in this consolidated action, and other plaintiffs' counsel  
3 in overlapping litigation in Florida and Massachusetts. This list is not exhaustive.

4 14. In addition, my firm has incurred approximately \$5,200 in costs associated with  
5 this case, which relate to filing fees, service costs, travel expenses related to attending a hearing  
6 before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, and marketing costs specific to class  
7 members in the instant action.

8 15. Both Mr. Wucetich and myself currently bill at the hourly rate of \$925 per hour.  
9 That rate is commensurate with the market rate for similarly experienced attorneys performing  
10 similar work in the Los Angeles area and other metropolitan areas. Accordingly, our base  
11 lodestar figure equates to \$537,425 (5812 hours x \$925.00 = \$537,425). However, in an effort to  
12 address any concerns regarding all timekeepers being partners, for purposes of the this fees  
13 motion my firm seeks only a blended rate for both Mr. Wucetich and myself of \$750 per hour.  
14 We have both been repeatedly approved at that blended rate in other class action cases in both the  
15 Los Angeles and San Francisco areas, as well as elsewhere. *See, e.g., Muller et al. v. PepsiCo,*  
16 *Inc. et al.*, San Francisco Superior Court Case No. CGC-22-597909 and *Stevens v. PepsiCo, Inc.*  
17 *et al.*, Case No. 22-cv-00802 (S.D.N.Y.) (4/4/23 Final Approval Order and Judgment Granting  
18 Fees to Wucetich & Korovilas LLP based on \$750 blended rate); *In re Neutron Wage & Hour*  
19 *Cases*, Case No. CJC-19-005044 (San Francisco Superior Court) (7/13/21 Order Granting  
20 Settlement Approval and Awarding Attorneys' Fees); *Habelito v. Guthy-Renter LLC*, Case No.  
21 BCC499558 (Los Angeles Superior Court) (5/15/2017 Order Granting Final Approval)  
22 (approving award of fees to Wucetich & Korovilas LLP based on \$700 hourly rate); *In re*  
23 *DirecTV Wage & Hour Cases*, JCCP 4850, Lead Case No. 1-14-CV-274709 (Santa Clara  
24 Superior Court) (7/19/19 Final Order and Judgement Granting Fees to Wucetich & Korovilas  
25 LLP based on \$700 hourly rate). At this lower blended rate the base lodestar figure for my firm  
26 would equate to \$435,750 (581 hours x \$750 = \$435,750).

27 16. In preparing time record reports in connection with motions for final approval and  
28 attorneys' fees, I exercise my judgment to often reduce the amount of time initially logged, based

1 on my reasonable judgment of how long a particular task should have taken, and have done so in  
2 this case. Typically, I would estimate that I reduce total amounts of time initially logged by  
3 approximately 5-10%. The lodestar figures in this declaration do not reflect additional time yet to  
4 be incurred, in connection with the hearings on Plaintiffs' motion for final approval and motion  
5 for attorneys' fees, attendance at hearing on the motions, any additional briefing the Court may  
6 request, and potentially handling any appeals. Accordingly, the projected lodestar amounts  
7 reflected in this declaration are subject to change.

8 17. The settlement agreement also provides that Plaintiffs may request approval by the  
9 Court of service awards in the amount of up to \$7,500 each for their time and effort in  
10 spearheading and prosecuting this case and obtaining monetary relief for the class. Each plaintiff,  
11 including Mr. Muller and Mr. Knezevich, spent a substantial amount of time and effort in  
12 prosecuting this case, including researching and retaining counsel, extensive meetings with  
13 counsel to substantiate the factual bases of the claims, producing relevant documents and  
14 information, participating in regular communication with counsel throughout the duration of the  
15 case regarding the case status and strategy going forward, and providing the facts and evidence to  
16 prove the allegations in the complaint. Plaintiffs all demonstrated a strong commitment to this  
17 case. Plaintiffs Muller and Knezevich, were, in particular, instrumental in gathering other class  
18 members to report their experiences, volunteer to be interviewed by counsel, and provide  
19 additional factual support for the case. Plaintiffs were available to counsel as needed. The  
20 information and aid that they provided to counsel was invaluable and ensured the successful  
21 resolution of this case. Furthermore, Plaintiffs have taken a substantial risk by electing to have  
22 their names as part of the public record in this lawsuit. Any time they attempt to seek new  
23 employment or are under investigation by a prospective employer, any search for lawsuits  
24 brought by them will be disclosed and they will have to deal with the possible stigma of bringing  
25 a class action lawsuit. The named plaintiffs have each submitted declarations attesting to their  
26 efforts, previously filed in connection with the motion for attorneys' fees. As such, the incentive  
27 award they seek is fully deserved and well justified.

1  
2 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is  
3 true and accurate.

4 Execute this 17th day of October, 2023, at Los Angeles, California.

5  
6   
7

8 \_\_\_\_\_  
DIMITRIOS V. KOROVILAS